DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 322 TM 001 487

AUTHOR Blough, John A.
TITLE Participant Evaluation of UCEA Urban Simulation Materials and Workshops.
PUB DATE Apr 72
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, Illinois, April 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Evaluation Techniques; Instructional Materials; Material Development; Participant Satisfaction; *Principals; Questionnaires; *Simulated Environment; *University Extension; *Urban Schools; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Urban Simulation Project; URBSIM

ABSTRACT

One of the major program goals of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) is the design, development, and production of a series of simulation materials for the preservice and inservice training of urban educational administrators. This paper presents evaluative information regarding the Janus Junior High Principalship Simulation, the first simulation to be completed. The school is an actual inner-city junior high school located in Monroe City, North Columbia. Components of the urban simulation (URBSIM) project are listed. Data collected both from participants in brief introductory dissemination institutes and from those who participated in full-length training workshops are presented in evaluations of selected components of the Janus URBSIM materials. The study indicated that the current UCEA dissemination strategy of introducing simulation materials by means of university-sponsored institutes and of collecting materials evaluation data at those institutes is an effective dissemination strategy. (DB)

ED 064322

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF UCEA URBAN SIMULATION MATERIALS AND WORKSHOPS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

John A. Elough
Associate Director
University Council for Educational Administration

T: 001 482

Presented at the Annual Meeting of
The American Educational Research Association
April 7, 1972
Chicago, Illinois

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF UCEA URBAN SIMULATION MATERIALS AND WORKSHOPS

One of the major program goals of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) for the five year period 1969-74 is the design, development, and production of a series of simulation materials for the preservice and inservice training of urban educational administrators. Supported in part by grants from the U. S. Office of Education, the urban simulation (URBSIM) project represents a unique example in American education of the "critical mass" principle in development.[1] More than 80 professors from about 40 universities and a number of others from related organizations have thus far been involved in developmental work associated with the URBSIM project. Another 100 educators from nearly 50 universities have been involved in demonstrating and disseminating URBSIM products, as they have become available, in regional university-sponsored institutes. Three sets of simulations-- the Janus Junior High School Principalship, the Wilson Senior High School Principalship, and the Abraham Lincoln Elementary School Principalship -- have thus far been completed. A number of additional role and process simulations are presently in various stages of development.

The purpose of this paper is to present evaluative information regarding the Janus Junior High Principalship Simulation, the first simulation to be completed. Data has been gathered both from participants in brief introductory dissemination institutes and from those who have participated in full-length training workshops.

This information has been sought for the purpose of assisting developers on the UCEA Central Staff and on simulation project development teams to create more effective instructional materials in ongoing and future simulation development efforts. In as much as a series of discrete but related simulations are to be produced over a period of time in the URBSIM project, one of the basic developmental principles in the overall program design has been to encourage each development team to build upon and extend the work of its predecessors. The information reported herein is seen as a portion of the data necessary to achieve that objective. All of the information reported here was obtained from written questionnaires administered in institutes and workshops under moderately controlled conditions. The data are entirely subjective, and the usual caveats apply. Nonetheless, this kind of information is seen by those responsible for the URBSIM effort as appropriate and useful in contributing to the achievement of stated project goals.

The Janus Junior High School Principalship Simulation

Janus Junior High School is based upon and represents an actual inner-city junior high school located in Monroe City, North Columbia. URBSIM components of the Janus Junior High School Principalship Simulation include the following:

1. The Monroe City Background Library: 15 background booklets describing various aspects of Monroe City and its school system.

2. Background Film: "Monroe City" (30 minutes, color).

3. Two 35 mm color slide presentations including audio taped narrations: "Janus Junior High School: Its Attendance Area," and "Janus Junior High School: The School."

4. Janus Student Handbook.

5. Janus Data Bank: about 150 pages of material replicating that found in file cabinets in the Janus Principal's office; includes 3 audio tapes.

6. Five filmed critical incidents (20 minutes, black and white).

7. Three filmed critical incidents (10 minutes, color).

8. Janus In-Basket I: 22 decision items.

9. Janus In-Basket II: 22 additional decision items.

10. Audio taped interruptions.

11. Janus expendable materials.

12. Janus principalship instructor's manual.

13. Suggestions for use of the UCEA Monroe City simulations.

14. Packet of specimen evaluation and response forms.

The Janus simulation was introduced at 15 regional university-sponsored UCEA institutes in the United States and Canada in early 1971. Among the several purposes of the Janus institutes was the aggregation of critical evaluations of the materials by those who were in attendance at these two day institute sessions. An evaluation questionnaire was designed by Alan K. Gaynor, then Associate Director of UCEA and now Associate Professor of Educational Administration at Boston University, and was administered by institute directors to 236 participants at 10 Janus institutes.[2]

Participant Evaluation of the Janus Simulation: Institutes vs. Workshops

The Janus Institutes were relatively short in duration and were designed primarily to introduce the materials, rather than to use them for training. Therefore, it was decided that a second set of participant evaluations of the Janus materials reflecting actual

workshop training use should be sought. From the development standpoint, a major purpose of the second study was to gain an indication of how critical evaluations of the materials obtained during introductory institutes compared with critical evaluations obtained during actual use by student participants. The second study was conducted during the summer of 1971. Questionnaires similar to the Gaynor instrument were administered to 96 workshop participants in 6 separate workshops. The typical summer workshop included in this study was of about 35 hours in length, with the training focused solely on the Janus Principalship role.

Institute and workshop participant evaluations of selected components of the Janus URBSIM materials are presented below.

Comparison of Institute and Workshop Evaluation of Janus Simulation Components

(Institutes included in this summary (n=10): Alberta, Berkeley, Buffalo, Colorado, Connecticut, Houston, Illinois, Minnesota, William and Mary, one unidentified. N for Institute participants = 236. Workshops included in this summary (n=6): Buffalo, Cornell, Houston, Tennessee (2), and Plattsburgh. N for workshop participants = 96. Because all Janus components were not used in all institutes and workshops, n for participants varies.)

	INSTITUTES	WORKSHOPS
1. The background film, "Monroe City"		
a. Technical Quality		
(1) outstanding	= 86 (38%)	28 (36%)
(2) good	= 132 (58%)	48 (62%)
(3) poor	= 8 (4%)	1 (2%)

	INSTITUTES	WORKSHOPS
b. Interest		
(1) outstanding	= 40 (18%)	26 (34%)
(2) good	= 150 (67%)	47 (61%)
(3) poor	= 35 (15%)	4 (5%)
c. Giving a "feel" for the City		
(1) outstanding	= 29 (13%)	20 (26%)
(2) good	= 114 (51%)	51 (67%)
(3) poor	= 80 (36%)	5 (7%)
2. "The Attendance Area" Slide Presentation		
a. Technical Quality		
(1) outstanding	= 99 (45%)	46 (48%)
(2) good	= 116 (52%)	50 (52%)
(3) poor	= 7 (3%)	0 (0%)
b. Interest		
(1) outstanding	= 89 (40%)	46 (48%)
(2) good	= 128 (57%)	50 (52%)
(3) poor	= 8 (4%)	0 (0%)
c. Value As a Source of Information for the Principal of Janus		
(1) outstanding	= 106 (48%)	46 (48%)
(2) good	= 107 (48%)	50 (52%)
(3) poor	= 8 (4%)	0 (0%)
3. "The School" Slide Presentation		
a. Technical Quality		
(1) outstanding	= 75 (33%)	29 (33%)
(2) good	= 138 (62%)	59 (67%)
(3) poor	= 11 (5%)	0 (0%)

	INSTITUTES	WORKSHOPS
b. Interest		
(1) outstanding	= 73 (33%)	37 (40%)
(2) good	= 142 (64%)	55 (60%)
(3) poor	= 7 (3%)	0 (0%)
c. Value As a Source of Information for the Principal		
(1) outstanding	= 75 (34%)	46 (50%)
(2) good	= 133 (60%)	45 (49%)
(3) poor	= 12 (6%)	1 (1%)

4. The Kinescopes (5 Black and White filmed critical incidents)

a. Overall Technical Quality - All Incidents		
(1) outstanding	= 6 (3%)	27 (32%)
(2) good	= 42 (19%)	48 (56%)
(3) poor	= 176 (78%)	10 (12%)
b. The Drug Scene		
(1) Believability		
(a) outstanding	= 24 (10%)	29 (50%)
(b) good	= 143 (57%)	21 (36%)
(c) poor	= 83 (33%)	8 (14%)
(2) Utility for Instruction		
(a) outstanding	= 27 (12%)	33 (55%)
(b) good	= 137 (61%)	21 (35%)
(c) poor	= 59 (27%)	6 (10%)
c. The Student Cafeteria Boycott		
(1) Believability		
(a) outstanding	= 28 (12%)	24 (41%)
(b) good	= 136 (60%)	26 (44%)
(c) poor	= 62 (28%)	9 (15%)
(2) Utility for Instruction		
(a) outstanding	= 33 (15%)	24 (42%)
(b) good	= 133 (59%)	31 (53%)
(c) poor	= 58 (26%)	3 (5%)

	INSTITUTES	WORKSHOPS
d. Black Student-White Teacher Confrontation		
(1) Believability		
(a) outstanding	= 82 (36%)	44 (67%)
(b) good	= 124 (55%)	22 (33%)
(c) poor	= 19 (9%)	0 (0%)
(2) Utility for Instruction		
(a) outstanding	= 68 (30%)	45 (68%)
(b) good	= 131 (59%)	21 (32%)
(c) poor	= 24 (11%)	0 (0%)
e. Black Students-Principal Confrontation		
(1) Believability		
(a) outstanding	= 79 (34%)	39 (42%)
(b) good	= 132 (58%)	53 (58%)
(c) poor	= 18 (8%)	0 (0%)
(2) Utlity for Instruction		
(a) outstanding	= 92 (41%)	55 (58%)
(b) good	= 123 (54%)	39 (41%)
(c) poor	= 12 (5%)	1 (1%)
f. Teacher Strike		
(1) Believability		
(a) outstanding	= 52 (23%)	10 (28%)
(b) good	= 131 (57%)	21 (58%)
(c) poor	= 47 (20%)	5 (14%)
(2) Utility for Instruction		
(a) outstanding	= 37 (16%)	17 (47%)
(b) good	= 129 (57%)	14 (39%)
(c) poor	= 62 (27%)	5 (14%)
5. The Three Color Filmed Critical Incidents		
a. Overall Technical Quality - All Incidents		
(1) outstanding	= 118 (51%)	39 (48%)
(2) good	= 110 (48%)	40 (49%)
(3) poor	= 2 (1%)	2 (3%)

	INSTITUTES	WORKSHOPS
b. "The Outsider" (non-student visitor and teacher in the hall)		
(1) Believability		
(a) outstanding	= 109 (48%)	42 (58%)
(b) good	= 101 (44%)	28 (38%)
(c) poor	= 17 (8%)	3 (4%)
(2) Utility for Instruction		
(a) outstanding	= 95 (41%)	44 (61%)
(b) good	= 123 (54%)	26 (36%)
(c) poor	= 11 (5%)	2 (3%)
c. "Outside Advice" (citizens' committee requests police in the school)		
(1) Believability		
(a) outstanding	= 87 (38%)	35 (41%)
(b) good	= 108 (47%)	46 (54%)
(c) poor	= 33 (15%)	4 (5%)
(2) Utility for Instruction		
(a) outstanding	= 111 (49%)	51 (62%)
(b) good	= 104 (46%)	31 (37%)
(c) poor	= 12 (5%)	1 (1%)
d. "A Sincere Proposal" (for black and white faculty to meet socially)		
(1) Believability		
(a) outstanding	= 55 (24%)	15 (22%)
(b) good	= 136 (59%)	42 (63%)
(c) poor	= 39 (17%)	10 (15%)
(2) Utility for Instruction		
(a) outstanding	= 46 (19%)	16 (31%)
(b) good	= 133 (56%)	31 (61%)
(c) poor	= 59 (25%)	4 (8%)

The foregoing data indicate, in general, that institute audiences tend to be more critical of simulation materials than workshop audiences. This is a significant finding in terms of development and dissemination strategy, for it suggests that simulation materials which pass the test of introduction through university-sponsored institutes will be favorably received when they are later used in actual instructional situations.

The data reflect two major decisions about Janus components which were made as a result of Gaynor's institute feedback. The first decision had to do with the "Monroe City" color film. As institute directors proceeded through their schedule of 15 Janus institutes, it became clear that a carefully conceived instructional strategy would be necessary to make effective use of the Monroe City film in teaching situations. Such a strategy was designed and implemented by the workshop directors during the summer workshops. It appears likely that the newly developed instructional strategy relating to the "Monroe City" film would account in large part for the improved ratings of that component in workshops as compared to institutes.

In the second instance, the low ratings accorded to the five black and white filmed incidents on the technical quality criterion resulted in a decision to completely re-shoot those incidents. The substantially higher ratings accorded to the five re-photographed black and white filmed incidents in the workshop setting would indicate that this effort justified the additional development cost involved in re-staging and producing an improved version of the film.

Workshop Participant Evaluation of Janus Components Not Evaluated at Institutes

Because of the short duration of the Janus Institutes, a number of the Janus written components could not be evaluated by institute participants. In the more extensive time period available for workshop instruction, however, it was possible for workshop participants to evaluate these particular written components of the simulation. Simulation components in this category include the Monroe City Background Library, Janus In-Basket I,

Janus In-Basket II, the Janus Data Bank, and a series of structured feedback instruments.

The structured feedback instruments were designed to fill, at least in part, a recognized shortcoming which has existed in most education simulation experiences. The need to be met here is the provision to workshop participants of conceptually organized feedback information regarding their own behavior and performance. A number of pilot participant feedback instruments were developed during the spring of 1971 for use in the Wilson Senior High School principalship instructional materials institutes. As these pilot structured feedback instruments were designed to be used with all three URBSIM principalship simulations, they were available for use in the Janus workshops during the summer of 1971. The structured feedback instruments so used include (1) The Value Resolution Scale, (2) The Action Analysis Profile, (3) The Means of Communication Profile, and (4) The Value Assumptions Profile.[3]

A summary of workshop participant evaluations of these written materials is presented below.

Workshop Participant Evaluation of Various Janus Simulation Components

1. Evaluation of the Monroe City Background Library booklets:

(1) excellent	= 55 (60%)
(2) good	= 36 (40%)
(3) fair	= 0 (0%)
(4) poor	= 0 (0%)

2. Evaluation of the In-Basket I materials:

(1) excellent	= 65 (68%)
(2) good	= 31 (32%)
(3) fair	= 0 (0%)
(4) poor	= 0 (0%)

3. Evaluation of the In-Basket II materials:

(1)	excellent	= 61 (64%)
(2)	good	= 33 (34%)
(3)	fair	= 1 (1%)
(4)	poor	= 1 (1%)

4. Evaluation of the Janus Data Bank:

a. (1

(1)	too extensive	= 2 (2%)
(2)	about right	= 62 (65%)
(3)	too limited	= 32 (33%)

b.

(1)	highly useful	= 36 (38%)
(2)	of some use	= 57 (59%)
(3)	of little use	= 3 (3%)

5. The Value Resolution Scale (administered twice as a pre- and post-simulation instrument):

a. First (Pre-Simulation) Administration -

(1)	highly useful	= 21 (25%)
(2)	of some use	= 57 (68%)
(3)	of little use	= 6 (7%)

b. Second (Post-Simulation) Administration -

(1)	highly useful	= 43 (53%)
(2)	of some use	= 28 (35%)
(3)	of little use	= 10 (12%)

6. The Action Analysis Profile:

(1)	highly useful	= 38 (48%)
(2)	of some use	= 41 (51%)
(3)	of little use	= 1 (1%)

7. The Means of Communication Profile:

(1)	highly useful	= 34 (42%)
(2)	of some use	= 41 (51%)
(3)	of little use	= 6 (7%)

8. The Value Assumptions Profile:

(1)	highly useful	= 22 (28%)
(2)	of some use	= 45 (58%)
(3)	of little use	= 11 (14%)

The foregoing data indicate that the Monroe City Background Library and Janus In-Baskets I and II were well received in the six workshops, with about two-thirds of the participants (60% to 68%) rating them "excellent" and about one-third (32% to 40%) rating them "good." About two-thirds (65%) of the respondents rated the Janus Data Bank as "about right" in comprehensiveness, with most of the remaining respondents (33%) finding it "too limited." A minority of the respondents (38%) rated the Data Bank as "highly useful," however, with most (59%) rating it only as "of some use."

Some variation is shown in ratings accorded the structured feedback instruments. Over half (53%) found the post-simulation administration of the Value Resolution Scale "highly useful," and nearly half (48%) accorded the Action Analysis Profile a "highly useful" rating. The lowest rating was placed on the Value Assumptions Profile, rated by 58% as "of some use" and by 14% as "of little use."

Evaluation of the Workshop Experience

The Monroe City URBSIM materials are the most extensive and complex simulation exercises which have thus far been developed for the inservice and preservice preparation of educational administrators. Earlier simulations, such as the UCEA Jefferson and Madison materials, have usually been viewed as useful and satisfying experiences by participants, as professors of educational administration who have used those materials will attest. (It should be noted that we are here speaking of subjective evaluation of the simulation experience itself, as distinct from measured behavioral change or the impact of simulation training on post-simulation performance. These latter issues are beyond the scope of this report.) Some of those involved in development of the Monroe City principalship

simulations wondered, on occasion, whether the materials they were developing were too "demanding," too "tough," or too frustrating to yield the affective rewards to participants which have come to be associated with simulation experiences. For this reason, workshop participants were asked to respond to a series of items related to the Janus principalship workshop experience. The item stems and response frequencies are presented below.

Evaluation of the Janus Workshop Experience

1. In this simulation, I learned most from:[4]

(1)	the materials	= 25 (18%)
(2)	other participants	= 74 (53%)
(3)	observing my own behavior	= 32 (23%)
(4)	other	= 8 (6%)

2. This workshop would be most useful for:[4]

(1)	experienced administrators	= 34 (20%)
(2)	beginning administrators	= 71 (43%)
(3)	those aspiring to be administrators	= 44 (26%)
(4)	teachers	= 13 (8%)
(5)	other	= 5 (3%)

3. In general, I was able to identify with Leslie Bunker (principal of Janus):

(1)	very well	= 15 (16%)
(2)	rather well	= 51 (54%)
(3)	somewhat	= 27 (29%)
(4)	not at all	= 1 (1%)

4. The "urban reality" of the simulation was:

(1)	highly convincing	= 50 (53%)
(2)	moderately convincing	= 45 (47%)
(3)	unconvincing	= 0 (0%)

5. Compared to other courses, seminars, and workshops I have had in educational administration, the Janus simulation was:

(1)	the best	= 49 (53%)
(2)	better than most	= 36 (39%)
(3)	about average	= 8 (8%)
(4)	worse than most	= 0 (0%)
(5)	the worst	= 0 (0%)

6. As a result of this workshop, my desire to become or remain an administrator has been:

(1)	increased	= 46 (48%)
(2)	not changed	= 48 (50%)
(3)	reduced	= 2 (2%)

As these data indicate, more than 9 out of 10 (92%) participants evaluated the Janus simulation experience as better than most other preparatory program work, with over half (53%) ranking it as "the best." Few participants (2%) were apparently deterred from the principalship by the workshop experience. Over half (53%) of the participants felt that they learned most from other participants, and 7 out of 10 (70%) felt that they were able to identify with the Janus principalship role (Leslie Bunker) "rather well" or "very well."

Conclusion

In summary, this study indicates that the current UCEA dissemination strategy of introducing simulation materials by means of university-sponsored institutes and of collecting materials evaluation data at those institutes is an effective dissemination strategy. Since institute audiences appear to be more critical of simulation components than workshop participants, it may be suggested that simulation components which successfully meet institute evaluation standards will be seen as effective when used for actual instructional purposes in workshops.

The generally favorable evaluation of the structured participant feedback instruments would appear to support and encourage further development work on these materials. And, finally, the Janus simulation experience was seen by participants as valuable and satisfying by nearly all participants, with 92% rating it as "better than most" or "the best" educational administration program component which they had experienced.

REFERENCES

[1] For a detailed report on the UCEA URBSIM project, see John A. Blough, Jack A. Culbertson, W. Michael Martin, and Rodney W. Pirtle, The Simulation of an Urban School System for Use in Preparing Educational Administrators (Final Report, Project No. 9-0544, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, November, 1971).

[2] Alan K. Gaynor, "Janus Institutes Evaluation Questionnaires," (University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio, March 10, 1971). (Mimeographed.)

[3] These instruments are reproduced and discussed in Alan K. Gaynor and L. Jackson Newell, "Structured Feedback Instruments," Blough, et al., The Simulation of An Urban School System, op cit.

[4] N exceeds 96 as some respondents checked more than one response.